NAMI-996

PREDICTING SUCCESS IN NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICER TRAINING

Floyd E. Peterson, Richard F. Booth,

Norman E. Lane, and Rosalie K. Ambler

February 1967

NAVAL AEROSPACE MEDICAL INSTITUTE
NAVAL AEROSPACE MEDICAL CENTER
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

PREDICTING SUCCESS IN NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICER TRAINING

Floyd E. Peterson, Richard F. Booth,

Norman E. Lane, and Rosalie K. Ambler

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
MF022.01.02.5002.9

Approved by

Ashton Graybiel, MD
Director of Research

Released by

Captain H. C. Hunley, MC, USN
Commanding Officer

15 February 1967

NAVAL AEROSPACE MEDICAL INSTITUTE
NAVAL AEROSPACE MEDICAL CENTER
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

SUMMARY PAGE

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to develop a system for the prediction of student success or failure in the Naval Flight Officer (NFO) program for use during Basic NFO training.

FINDINGS

Two initial selection tests (an academic ability test and a mechanical comprehension test) plus two academic performance measures resulted in a multiple correlation coefficient of .45 with a dichotomous criterion of pass/attrite. Decision making regarding the retention of marginal students could be improved by use of the prediction formula generated in this study.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1963, the Aviation Psychology Division of the Naval Aerospace Medical Institute has provided information to Naval aviation training administrators confronted with decisions of whether to drop or retain a student who is having difficulties in flight training (1). Upon request, administrators are given the computed probability of a specific student successfully completing the flight program. These probabilities are obtained by appropriately weighting valid past performance measures such as initial selection test scores, academic course grades, and flight training grades. Knowledge of such probabilities has improved the accuracy of decisions regarding marginal student pilots, leading to increased efficiency in the utilization of pilot training facilities and personnel.

In addition to training pilots, the Naval Aviation Training Command trains Naval Flight Officers (NFO's). These include navigators, radar intercept officers, and other nonpilot aviation officer specialists. Student NFO's complete the same beginning academic courses as do students entering flight training. After this phase, student NFO's begin four months of training in Basic Naval Aviation Officer (BNAO) School. Students are formally designated as NFO's upon graduation from advanced training in their area of specialization.

The majority of attrition from the NFO program occurs in BNAO School. Approximately 20 per cent of the student input appears before a Training Advisory Board sometime during this period. This 20 per cent is divided almost equally between students who are in academic difficulty and students voluntarily requesting separation from the program. Administrators serving on the Training Advisory Board face the same decisions as do administrators in the flight training program and all other educational programs, i.e., which students in academic difficulty should be given additional instructional time and which should be considered unworthy of additional instruction?

The purpose of this study was to develop a system for the prediction of student success or failure in NFO training and thus assist the training administrators in their decisions.

PROCEDURE AND RESULTS

Training records of 966 nonofficer student NFO's entering training between May, 1964 and April, 1966 were used as basic data for this study. Excluded from the analysis were students dropped for reasons of medical disqualification, personal hardship, disciplinary action, and death.

The variables chosen for consideration as possible predictors of a dichotomous criterion of pass/attrite (P/A) included the initial selection test scores and the grades received during the flight preparation portion of the academic courses prior to BNAO School. The means and standard deviations of these variables for students entering BNAO School are shown in Table 1.

Table I

Means and Standard Deviations for Students Entering BNAO School (N = 958)

	Mean	S.D.
I. Initial Selection Tests		
Aviation Qualification Test* (AQT)	78.1	13.6
Mechanical Comprehension Test (MCT)	53.9	9.8
Spatial Apperception Test (SAT)	17.4	6.5
Biographical Inventory (BI)	30.2	14.3
II. Flight Preparation Scores		
Aerodynamics (Aero)	45.5	8.9
Navigation (Nav)	46.1	9.3
Power Plants (Power)	47.1	10.5
Physiology (Phy)	50.5	10.2
Physical Training (P.T.)	50.6	6.0
Peer Rating (P.R.)	50.3	9.6

An intercorrelation matrix including all predictor variables and the P/A criterion is shown in Table II.

Table II

Intercorrelation Matrix Including All Predictor Variables and The Criterion

	MCT	SAT	BI	Aero	Nav	Power	Phy	P.T.	P.R.	P.A.
AQT	.44**	.29	.13	.49	.49	.36	.30	.10	.14	.34
MCT		.38	.42	.44	.31	.42	.34	.17	.16	.35
SAT			.25	.26	.27	.20	.13	.16	.14	.20
BI				.19	.09	.22	.14	.15	.16	.15
Aero					.53	.53	.42	.20	.16	.27
Nav						.43	.31	.24	.29	.35
Power							.44	.16	.17	.30
Phy								.23	.09	.23
P. T.									.28	.10
P. R.										.15

*a test of academic ability.

**r = .10 required for significance beyond the .01 level, one-tailed.

The Wherry-Doolittle method was used to determine which variables in combination would yield the highest multiple correlation with the criterion. When all variables were used, six were selected as significant predictors. However, the contribution of the last two variables selected was not considered sufficient to warrant their inclusion in the predictor score formula. Thus, the weights to be applied to the first four variables chosen were computed. The variables chosen and the multiple R's are shown in Table III.

Table III

Variables Selected for Predictor Score Formula

Variables Selected	Cum. Multiple R	Cum. Shrunken R
Navigation	.360	.352
MCT	.445	.434
AQT	.458	.448
Power Plants	.463	.452

By appropriately weighting each of the four variables selected, predictor scores were computed for all students included in the analysis sample. Predictor score frequency distributions were constructed for the group that completed training and for the group of dropped students. From these frequency distributions, the percentile ranks and "percentage completion" statements shown in Appendix A were derived.

Crossvalidation was accomplished by dividing the sample randomly and applying the Wherry-Doolittle method to each subsample. Crossvalidation resulted in essentially the same variable weights and multiple correlation coefficients for each subsample and the total group.

DISCUSSION

As can be seen in Table II, all variables were significantly correlated with the criterion. However, after the best four were chosen, little or no improvement was added to the predictor score formula by the others.

An encouraging result of the study is the face validity of the four variables chosen. The variable receiving the largest weight was the Navigation grade. It is logical that scores received in a navigation course are predictive of future performance in a training program heavily loaded with instruction in navigation. The AQT and MCT can be considered measures of a student's potential performance. Scores received in Navigation and Power Plants, however, can be considered measures of how well the student actually uses his potential in academic situations similar to those encountered later in training.

As described in Appendix B, the predictor scores will be converted into percentile ranks and "percentage completion" statements. Percentile rank refers to that percentage of successful students in the past whose predictor score fell below a given point on the distribution.

The "percentage completion" statements indicate the proportion of students in various segments of the predictor score distribution who eventually completed training. As can be seen in Appendix A, two separate scales of "percentage completion" statements are presented. The first scale pertains to all students entering BNAO School who began NFO training as nonofficers (NAOC's or AOC's). The second scale pertains only to students (former NAOC's or AOC's) in academic difficulty, i.e., students who are about to appear before a Training Advisory Board. The two scales are presented so that "percentage completion" statements can be used accurately for two separate populations. For example, students not in academic difficulty have a higher expected completion rate than students with similar predictor scores who appear before the Training Advisory Board. Therefore, use of the first scale would apply to those about to enter BNAO School and those requesting transfer from another program. However, for students who are in difficulty, the expected completion rate is greatly reduced. Therefore, the second scale is constructed to indicate the proportion of students who, in the past, have been retained by the Training Advisory Board and who have completed training.

Data used in the present study were obtained from training records of students who entered the program as NAOC's or AOC's (college graduates with no previous military experience). The use of the predictor score formula obtained in this study is not warranted for students entering the program through any other procurement source. Due to the smaller number of students procured through other sources, more training data should be collected to properly develop additional formulas. One such predictor score formula presently being developed applies to students entering NFO training as officers.

REFERENCE

1. Shoenberger, R. W., Wherry, R. J., Jr., and Berkshire, J. R., Predicting success in aviation training. NSAM-873. Pensacola, Fla.: Naval School of Aviation Medicine, 1963.

APPENDIX A

Predictor Score Conversion Table

Predictor Score Intervals	Percentile Rank*	Percentage Completion	
		I Students Entering BNAO School	II Students Appearing Before Training Advisory Board
Less than 250	00		
250 - 289	00	No completions	No completions
290 - 329	00		
330 - 369	00		
370 - 409	01	———	———
410 - 449	02	40 out of 100	
450 - 489	03		
490 - 529	05		20 out of 100
530 - 569	08		
570 - 609	13	———	
610 - 649	18	70 out of 100	
650 - 689	27		
690 - 729	35		
730 - 769	42		———
770 - 809	51	———	
810 - 849	60		
850 - 889	67		
890 - 929	72		
930 - 969	78		
970 - 1009	85	95 out of 100	70 out of 100
1010 - 1049	90		
1050 - 1089	93		
1090 - 1129	96		
1130 - 1169	98		
1170 - 1209	99		
more than 1210	99		

- - - - - - - - - - -

*compared with successful students

APPENDIX B

Described below are the mechanics of the student prediction system developed for use in BNAO School:

1. When information on a student is needed, the student's name will be reported to the Student Prediction Section of the Naval Aerospace Medical Institute (NAMI).

2. On record at NAMI are the scores required for the predictor score formula (AQT, MCT, Navigation, and Power Plants). Providing the student entered training as an NAOC or AOC, a predictor score will be computed.

3. The predictor score will be referred to a table of percentile ranks and "percentage completion" statements.

4. Reported back will be the following information:

"Compared with the records of previously designated NFO's, this student's predictor score ranks in the _____ percentile. In the past, approximately _____ of 100 students entering BNAO School with a similar predictor score have completed training. Of students with a similar predictor score who appeared before a Training Advisory Board because of academic difficulty, only about _____ of 100 have completed training."

Unclassified
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
Naval Aerospace Medical Institute Pensacola, Florida 32512	Unclassified
	2b. GROUP N/A

3. REPORT TITLE

PREDICTING SUCCESS IN NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICER TRAINING

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

N/A

5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)

Peterson, Floyd E., LTJG, MSC, USNR, Booth, Richard F., ENS, MSC, USNR, Lane, Norman E., LTJG, MSC, USN, and Ambler, Rosalie K.

6. REPORT DATE	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
February 1967	7	1

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
b. PROJECT NO. MFO22.01.02.5002	NAMI-996
c.	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) 9
d.	

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

Distribution of this document is unlimited

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY
N/A	N/A

13. ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a system for the prediction of success or failure in the Naval Flight Officer (NFO) program for use during Basic NFO training.

Two initial selection tests (an academic ability test and a mechanical comprehension test) plus two academic performance measures resulted in a multiple correlation coefficient of .45 with a dichotomous criterion of pass/attrite. Decision making regarding the retention of marginal students could be improved by use of the prediction formula generated in this study.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

Unclassified
Security Classification

Unclassified
Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Aviation training						
Selection						
Prediction						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization *(corporate author)* issuing the report.

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers *(either by the originator or by the sponsor)*, also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

(3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring *(paying for)* the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS), (S), (C), or (U)*

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14 KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.

Unclassified
Security Classification